

11 DECEMBER 1998



Logistics

**SYSTEM EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT
REPORT**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at: <http://afpubs.hq.af.mil>.

OPR: HQ USAF/ILMY
(Lt Col Susanne LeClere)
Supersedes AFI 20-104, 1 September 1998.

Certified by: HQ USAF/ILMY
(Col Gary R. Sandiford)
Pages: 17
Distribution: F

This instruction, System Executive Management Report, outlines the procedures and offices of responsibility for compiling and coordinating information to develop the System Executive Management Report (SEMR). The SEMR is a semi-annual sustainment and readiness assessment of weapon system programs by the AFMC Single Manager (SM), to HQ USAF/IL, HQ AFMC, and the respective lead command. Assessments are based on a number of core indicators for current and projected years through the Future Year Defense Program (FYDP). This publication applies to all AF personnel who prepare, manage, or coordinate the SEMR. This instruction implements AFD 10-2, *Air Force Readiness*. Send comments and suggested improvements on AF Form 847, **Recommendation for Change of Publication**, through channels, to Weapons System Division, HQ USAF/ILMY, 1030 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1030.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This change replace paragraphs **2.4.1.1.**, **2.4.1.2.**, **2.6.6.** and **2.8.4.** with new paragraphs which adjust responsibilities due to the addition of an arbitration process for resolving Red/Green rating splits between the single manager and the lead MAJCOM. See the last attachment of the publication, IC 98-1, for the complete IC. A bar (|) indicates revision from previous edition.

1. Purpose of the Report. The SEMR is designed to capture historical data and future funding profiles, identify trends, and forecast the wartime capability of selected Air Force weapon systems. It provides senior leadership a cross system look at readiness and sustainment issues. The SEMR is supported with a computer software program.

1.1. Air Force Systems Contained in the Report. When systems reach Initial Operational Capability (IOC) a SEMR is required. Systems not supported through the SEMR software program will report

manually IAW the HQ AFMC SEMR Process Guide, Attachment 5. HQ USAF/XPP may direct reporting of selected systems prior to IOC.

1.2. System Additions/Deletions. PEOs and DACs may request systems be added or deleted from the SEMR. Requests should be forwarded to HQ USAF/ILM. HQ USAF/XPP will approve or disapprove requests.

1.3. Report Security Classification. The overall SEMR will retain the highest classification of the individual data sources and/or comments contained in the report. The report must be handled IAW AFI 31-401, *Managing the Information Security Program*. Individual indicators and reports may be unclassified if all comments and data are unclassified. Unclassified reports must be marked "For Official Use Only."

1.4. Reporting. Each 6-month SEMR cycle is based on the fiscal year. The SEMR is due to HQ USAF/IL no later than 15 June and 15 December. The June report is based on data through the end of the second quarter of the fiscal year (31 Mar). The December report is based on data through the end of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year (30 Sep).

1.4.1. Report Control. The SEMR is assigned Report Control Symbol (RCS): HAF-ILM (SA) 9711 and is designated emergency status code "D". Discontinue reporting during emergency conditions and do not transmit during MINIMIZE.

1.4.2. Data Sources. Air Force standard databases will be used for all metrics supporting first tier indicators, where applicable. Other data sources must be jointly identified and agreed to by the SM and lead command.

1.5. SEMR Software. All systems included in the SEMR software program must report using this automated program. Specific guidance for using the software program can be found in the HQ AFMC SEMR Process Guide.

1.6. Assessments. An overall system assessment is assigned by the SM, in coordination with the lead command. This assessment is based upon an analysis of all first and second tier indicators, but can also be influenced by the subjective evaluation of additional information from other sources. Assessments are in the form of a stop-light of green, yellow, or red. The overall system assessment, as well as the first tier indicator assessments, will be provided for the current (C) year, C+1, C+2, and C+6.

1.6.1. Assessment Definitions. A green assessment is assigned when the system/indicator has minor sustainment issues, but can meet programmed operational requirements. A yellow assessment depicts significant sustainment issues, but the system can still meet programmed operational requirements. A red is given when there are major sustainment issues that limit or prevent the system from meeting programmed operational requirements.

1.6.2. Assessment Trends. Each overall assessment may include a "trend arrow" to indicate the trend direction. An "arrow up" indicates a positive trend direction (i.e., yellow, but projected to improve to green), and an "arrow down" indicates a negative trend direction (i.e., yellow, but projected to go to red). An absence of an arrow indicates a projected steady state.

2. Responsibilities. To ensure the SEMR arrives at HQ USAF/IL by the established suspense date, it is imperative that all offices and individuals accomplish their respective responsibilities within the established suspense timeline.

2.1. HQ USAF Director of Installations and Logistics. HQ USAF/IL will develop policy and will:

- 2.1.1. Oversee program development, execution, and funding.
- 2.1.2. Issue the "SEMR Tasker Message" prior to each SEMR cycle, providing reporting cycle timelines to meet established suspense dates.
- 2.2. HQ USAF Weapons Systems Division. HQ USAF/ILMY (SEMR Office) will provide management direction and guidance to all commands. Additionally; they will:
 - 2.2.1. Provide Funding/Availability Multi-Method Allocator for Spares (FAMMAS)/ Windows Integrated Logistics Assessment Model (WINLAM) and Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) data to the applicable SMs.
 - 2.2.2. Approve requirements for additions, deletions, or modifications to first tier indicators, and implement software updates to reflect program changes.
 - 2.2.3. Distribute SEMRs to the appropriate mission and mission support panel chairs, and the HQ USAF/IL representative to the panels.
 - 2.2.4. Provide an executive overview briefing of the SEMR assessments to the Air Force senior leadership, through the Air Force Corporate Structure. The briefing will display both the SM's weapon system assessment, and the mission/mission support panel's assessment (if different).
 - 2.2.5. Provide an executive overview briefing of the SEMR assessments to the appropriate AF Program Executive Officers (AFPEO).
 - 2.2.6. Provide an executive overview of SEMR assessments to XOO for inclusion in the Joint Monthly Readiness Review (JMRR) quarterly scenario analysis.
 - 2.2.7. Coordinate requests for weapons system additions, deletions, or waivers to SEMR reporting requirements through HQ USAF/ILM and the functional directorate, and forward for approval/disapproval to HQ USAF/XPP.
 - 2.2.8. Provide feedback to the SMs and SEMR POCs within 30 days of the last briefing to the Air Force Corporate Structure. The feedback will be distributed via the Secret Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET).
- 2.3. HQ USAF Operations and Training. HQ USAF/XOOW (War and Mobilization Plans Division) will provide, as needed:
 - 2.3.1. Planning factors from the War and Mobilization Plan (WMP-5), Basic Planning Factors and Data.
 - 2.3.2. Apportionment data from the WMP-3, Part 1, Combat Forces.
- 2.4. HQ USAF Programs (XPP). In accordance with AFI 16-501, the Air Force Corporate Structure will review, assess, and adjudicate changes to the SEMRs.
 - 2.4.1. Mission and Mission Support Panels. With the full involvement and cooperation of the Integrated Process Teams (IPT) , the mission and mission support panels will:
 - 2.4.1.1. Fully review the SEMRs. If the lead MAJCOM has non-concurred (Red/Green split) with the SM on any weapon system assessment, the panel chair will serve as the arbitrator in attempting to resolve the disagreement. If the SM and the lead MAJCOM are still unable to resolve the Red/Green split, the panel's assessment of the weapon system will be the only assessment briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure. The goal is to reach consensus.

2.4.1.2. Concur or non-concur with the SMs assessment. Notify the SM or the SM's designated representative immediately if the panel non-concurs with the SM's assessment. The panel chair will attempt to adjudicate the disagreement in each weapon system assessment. If agreement cannot be reached, both the SM's assessment and the panel's assessment of the weapon system will be briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure, unless the disagreement involves a Red/Green split. In the case of a Red/Green split, the panel's assessment of the weapon system will be the only assessment briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure. The goal is to reach consensus.

2.4.1.3. Notify the appropriate AFPEOs of ongoing SEMR reviews, and invite to panel discussions.

2.4.1.4. Recommend to the Air Force Group whether or not to task any SMs to provide an expanded SEMR presentation to the Air Force Group.

2.4.2. Air Force Group. The Air Force Group will review the SEMR assessments during a SEMR executive overview briefing, presented by HQ USAF/ILMY. The Air Force Group will:

2.4.2.1. Determine to which level of the Air Force Corporate Structure the SEMR executive overview briefing will be elevated. As a minimum, it will be elevated to the Air Force Council once each fiscal year, usually following the second SEMR cycle (1 Apr-30 Sep).

2.4.2.2. Task selected SMs to provide an expanded SEMR presentation to the Air Force Group, if needed.

2.5. HQ Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC). HQ AFMC/DRB provides program oversight, guidance, and assistance to AFMC SMs. HQ AFMC functional directorates will identify points-of-contact (POC) and provide the names to HQ AFMC/DRB. Each AFMC Center will identify an overall Center SEMR POC and provide the names to HQ AFMC/DRB. The Center SEMR POC will work with the HQ AFMC/DRB Command SEMR POC.

2.5.1. HQ AFMC/DRB. This division will implement HQ Air Force SEMR policies and procedures, and monitor the SEMR timeline outlined in the SEMR Tasker Message, to ensure all reports arrive at HQ USAF/IL on time. Additionally, HQ AFMC/DRB will:

2.5.1.1. Disseminate guidance via HQ AFMC SEMR Process Guide and other correspondence.

2.5.1.2. Maintain a complete list of the SM SEMR POCs for all systems reported in the SEMR on the HQ AFMC SEMR homepage located at <http://afmc.wpafb.af.mil/HQ-AFMC/DR/drb/SEMR/semr.htm> (this address is case sensitive). The SM SEMR POCs prepare and coordinate the SEMR on behalf of the SM.

2.5.1.3. Maintain a list of MAJCOM SEMR POCs on the HQ AFMC SEMR homepage. The MAJCOM SEMR POCs are responsible for obtaining MAJCOM coordination on the reports prepared by the SMs.

2.5.1.4. Collect and review the SEMR for AFMC issues and completeness. Validate that all lead commands, and PEOs/DACs have coordinated on the reports prior to forwarding to HQ USAF/ILMY.

2.5.1.5. Distribute the SEMR throughout HQ AFMC and forward the final report to HQ AFMC/CC and HQ USAF/ILMY. Provide HQ AFMC feedback to the SMs within 30 days of

forwarding to HQ USAF.

2.5.1.6. Review justifications for first tier indicator changes, deletions, or additions. Forward justifications, along with a recommendation for approval or disapproval, to HQ USAF/ILMY.

2.5.1.7. Provide AFMC funding data, including, Materiel Support Division (MSD) data, to SMs.

2.6. Single Manager (SM). The SM is responsible for building the SEMR and assessing his/her weapon system . Additionally, the SM will:

2.6.1. In conjunction with the lead and using commands, develop second tier indicators for each system assessed in the SEMR. Second tier indicators provide the detailed data needed to assign stop-light assessments to the first tier indicators.

2.6.2. Collect and verify accuracy of all data not provided by HQ USAF/ILMY for all second tier indicators and provide guidance on assessment criteria to appropriate Product Group Managers (PGMs).

2.6.3. Analyze the data and rate each second tier indicator either green, yellow, or red, with up or down arrows, if appropriate, to indicate trend direction. The SM must provide comments on all red and yellow assessments, as well as downward green assessments.

2.6.4. Assess each of the five core categories as green, yellow, or red. The assessment will be based on analysis of all second tier indicators. Provide a first tier indicator assessment for the current year, and a projected assessment for the C +1, C+2, and C +6 (FYDP).

2.6.5. Provide overall green, yellow, or red assessment for the system and a forecasted green, yellow, or red assessment.

2.6.6. Send the completed SEMR to all lead commands for coordination and concurrence/non-concurrence. Every effort must be made to resolve differences of opinion on weapon system assessments. All Red/Green splits sent forward to the Air Staff will be arbitrated by the panel chair and if agreement cannot be reached, the panel will assign a stop-light rating and only the panel's assessment will be briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure.

2.6.7. Upon lead command coordination, send completed SEMR to the PEO/DAC for coordination.

2.6.8. Forward the coordinated SEMR to HQ AFMC/DRB by the suspense date established in the HQ USAF/IL "SEMR Tasker Message", and simultaneously send a courtesy copy to the lead command.

2.6.9. Forward the name, office symbol, phone number, and e-mail address of the SEMR POC to HQ AFMC/DRB, info HQ USAF/ILMY.

2.7. Materiel Group Manager (MGM) and Product Group Manager (PGM) Responsibilities. The MGM and PGM will provide appropriate information to the SM for use in their assessments by established suspense dates.

2.8. Lead Command Responsibilities. Overall responsibilities are outlined in AAFP 10-9, *Lead Operating Command Weapon Systems Management* and AFI 10-901, *Lead Operating Command—Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence (C4I) Systems Management*. Additionally, the lead command will:

2.8.1. Identify an overall lead command “SEMR POC”. The SEMR POC will work with HQ AFMC/DRB on SEMR processes and issues. Forward the name, office symbol, telephone number, and e-mail address to HQ AFMC/DRB, info HQ USAF/ILMY.

2.8.2. Support the SM in data collection.

2.8.3. Coordinate on all proposed changes, deletions, or additions to applicable system first tier indicators and assist the SM develop second tier indicators.

2.8.4. Incorporate using command concerns into a single response to the SM. Coordinate the consolidated response through all appropriate lead command (MAJCOM) divisions. Every effort must be made to resolve differences of opinion on weapon system assessments. All Red/Green splits sent forward to the Air Staff will be arbitrated by the panel chair and if agreement cannot be reached, the panel will assign a stop-light rating and only the panel’s assessment will be briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure.

2.8.5. Forward the completed SEMR, with comments, to the lead command (MAJCOM) Commander, or designated representative, for approval and signature.

2.9. Using Command Responsibilities. The using commands are an integral component of the SEMR process and may forward program concerns to the lead command to include in the program assessment.

2.10. PEO/DAC Responsibilities. The PEO/DAC will coordinate on the final SEMR assessment developed by the SM, and may forward report comments to the SM.

2.11. Unit/Wing Responsibilities. The reporting agencies will provide data as requested to verify/explain SEMR data and provide reasons for anomalies.

3. Indicators. All weapon system programs must be assessed by analyzing their respective first and second tier indicators. All weapon system programs (excluding ICBM) will use the same “standard” set of first tier indicators. The ICBM first tier indicators are unique and outlined separately. Any requests to not use the first tier indicators outlined below must be coordinated through HQ AFMC/DRB and approved by HQ USAF/ILM.

3.1. First Tier Indicators (standard). All weapon system programs (excluding ICBM) must be assessed by analyzing the first tier indicators defined below.

3.1.1. Combat Readiness. Portrays the ability of a system to support peacetime and wartime operational taskings. Takes into account current and projected capability, historical data, spare parts support, and any other unique system metrics. Ties combinations of indicators to system impact across the FYDP. Aircraft systems will use the FAMMAS model for projected mission capable rates and the WINLAM for wartime assessments.

3.1.2. System Performance. Depicts how the system performs at the using command level. Includes historical performance data collected by the using command to track system reliability and maintainability. Air Force level databases are preferred and will be used where applicable—reference paragraph [1.4.2](#).

3.1.3. Depot Level. Represents resources that AFMC and the SM manage to support the system for the user.

3.1.4. Funding. Examines funding areas required for system support.

- 3.1.5. Cost Performance. Examines costs for operating and supporting the system. The Cost of Ownership format at [Attachment 2](#) is presently used by HQ USAF/ILMY to project costs per flying hour for the SEMR briefing to the Air Force Corporate Structure. Single managers will not report cost performance data on their weapon systems until cost performance metrics are defined and approved by HQ USAF.
- 3.2. ICBM First Tier Indicator Categories. ICBMs require a unique set of first tier indicators to accurately portray sustainment and readiness issues. ICBM first tier indicators include:
- 3.2.1. Availability. Availability is measured by the Operational Readiness Rate (ORR). This includes scheduled and unscheduled off-alert hours. The ORR is calculated as the ratio of mission capable to possessed hours.
- 3.2.2. Reliability. Reliability is estimated at the system level by applying success/failure data and/or time and failure cumulative data to the appropriate model subsystem element.
- 3.2.3. Accuracy. Accuracy is measured in feet Circular Error Probable (CEP) and is based on the System Program Office's (SPO) engineering model flown to an operational trajectory.
- 3.2.4. Hardness. Hardness is measured qualitatively with current information that may contain cumulative elements from the assurance, surveillance, and maintenance programs.
- 3.2.5. Funding. Same as paragraph [3.1.4](#).
- 3.2.6. Cost Performance. Same as paragraph [3.1.5](#).
- 3.3. Overall Assessment. Consists of a combination of the assessments for the Current (C) Year, C+1, C+2 and C+6 (FYDP).
- 3.4. Second Tier Indicators. Second tier indicators are quality performance indicators that enable accurate assessments of first tier indicators.
- 3.5. System Assessments. When assigning stop-light assessments, SMs may also consider issues such as work-arounds, surge capability, information presented in Product Improvement Working Groups (PIWG), and any other pertinent factors. When this information influences the stop-light assessment, it should clearly be articulated in the comment section of the report.
- 3.6. Comments. Comments for red, yellow, and downward green assessments should address specific shortfalls, corrective actions required or in planning, and offices of primary responsibility. Get well dates and impacts should be fully addressed. Comments for all green down s should specifically address what is required to maintain a green .

WILLIAM P. HALLIN, Lt General, USAF
DCS/Installations & Logistics

Attachment 1**GLOSSARY OF SUPPORTING INFORMATION*****Abbreviations and Acronyms***

ABCCC—Airborne Command and Control Center
ABIDES—Automated Budget Interactive Data Exchange System
ACAT—Acquisition Category
ACM—Advanced Cruise Missile
ACTS—Air Combat Training System
AEWS—Atmospheric Early Warning System
AFI—Air Force Instruction
AFMC—Air Force Materiel Command
AFPD—Air Force Program Directive
AFSATCOM—Air Force Satellite Communications
AFSCN—Air Force Satellite Control Network
AFSOC—Air Force Special Operations Command
ALCM—Air Launched Cruise Missile
AMRAAM—Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile
ATCAL—Air Traffic Control and Landing System
AVFUEL—Aviation Fuel
AWACS—Airborne Warning and Control System
C—Current Year
CALCM—Conventional Air Launched Cruise Missile
CEP—Circular Error Probable
CLS—Contractor Logistics Support
CMAH—CINC Mobile Alternate Headquarters
CMC—Cheyenne Mountain Complex
COD—Cost of Operations Division
C4I—Command, Control, Communications, Computer and Information
DAC—Designated Acquisition Commander
DLR—Depot Level Repairable
DSCS—Defense Satellite Communications System
DMSP—Defense Meteorological Satellite Program

DSCS—Defense Satellite Communication System
DSP—Defense Support Program
EEIC—Element of Expense Investment Code
FAMMAS—Funding/Availability Multi-Method Allocator for Spares
FY—Fiscal Year
FYDP—Future Years Defense Plan
GPS—Global Positioning System
GTACS—Ground Theater Air Control System
HFGC—High Frequency Global Communication
ICBM—Inter-continental Ballistic Missile
ICS—Interim Contractor Support
IOC—Initial Operational Capability
ITW/AA—Integrated Tactical Warning/Attack Assessment
MEECN—Minimum Essential Emergency Communication Network
MGM—Materiel Group Manager
MHE—Materiel Handling Equipment
MILSATCOM—Military Satellite Communications
MPS—Mission Planning System
MSD—Materiel System Division
MWSSS—Missile Warning Space Surveillance Sensors
O&M—Operations and Maintenance
O&S—Operations and Support
ORR—Operational Readiness Rate
PEO—Program Executive Officer
PGM—Product Group Manager
PIWG—Product Improvement Working Group
RTS—Range Threat System
SecDef—Secretary of Defense
SEMR—System Executive Management Report
SESS—Space Environmental Support System
SM—Single Manager
SNDC²—Strategic Nuclear Deterrence Command and Control

SORTS—Status of Resources and Training System

SPO—System Program Office

TBM—Theater Battle Management

USAF—United States Air Force

WMP—War and Mobilization Plan

WINLAM—Windows Integrated Logistics Assessment Model

Terms

Air Force Acquisition Executive (AFAE)—The Air Force Senior Manager for Acquisition; the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition).

Circular Error Probable (DoD)—An indicator of the delivery accuracy of a weapon system, used as a factor in determining probable damage to a target. It is the radius of a circle within which half of a missile's projectiles are expected to fall.

Core Indicators—The first tier indicators used to assess weapon system sustainment and readiness in the SEMR.

Cost of Ownership—The summation of operations and maintenance (O&M) and the direct military personnel costs associated with a system or program.

Designated Acquisition Commander (DAC)—The individual who functions as the PEO on programs that are not assigned to a PEO. The commanders of product centers and air logistics centers act in this capacity. DACs, like PEOs, are accountable to the AFAE for execution of their assigned acquisition programs. Senior Manager that is one level below the AFAE.

First Tier Indicator—The five “core categories” in which every weapon system is evaluated, in order to determine the overall weapon system assessment/rating.

Funding/Availability Multi-Method Allocator for Spares (FAMMAS)—Air Force parametric model that forecasts future mission capable rates based on funding projections of readiness spares for aircraft.

Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP)—The official document and database that summarizes Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) approved plans and programs for the DoD. It is updated five times every 2-year PPBS cycle. The FYDP represents a 6-year time frame (for FY96, the FYDP was FY98-03).

Initial Operational Capability (IOC) (DoD)—The first attainment of the capability to employ effectively a weapon, item of equipment, or system of approved specific characteristics, and which is manned or operated by an adequately trained, equipped, and supported military unit or force.

Lead Command—The command identified as the primary weapon system advocate in AFD 10-9, *Lead Operating Command Weapon System Management*. The Air Staff functional manager assigns a lead command for aerospace equipment not listed in AFD 10-9.

Mission Capable (DoD)—Materiel condition of an aircraft indicating it can perform at least one, and potentially all, of its designated missions.

Overall Assessment—The assessment that reflects the overall sustainment and readiness posture of a particular weapon system program. The overall assessment is assigned after carefully evaluating first and second tier indicator data. For the SEMR, an overall assessment is assigned for the current (C) year,

C+1, C+2 and C+6 (FYDP).

Program Executive Officer (PEO)—The corporate operating official who supervises a portfolio of mission related Acquisition Category (ACAT) I and selected programs. The PEO is accountable to the Air Force Acquisition Executive.

Product Improvement—A conscientiously applied process of identification, analysis, and corrective action of product deficiencies. In this process, the user identifies deficiencies in aerospace equipment and informs the responsible single manager.

Product Improvement Working Group (PIWG)—A number of individuals, representing aerospace equipment users and single managers, assembled together for the purpose of product improvement.

Program Executive Officer (PEO)—The corporate operating official who supervises a portfolio of mission related Acquisition Category (ACAT) I and selected programs. The PEO is accountable to the AFAE.

Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS)—The DoD resources management system controlled by SecDef and used to establish, maintain, and revise the FYDP and the DoD portion of the President's Budget.

Second Tier Indicators—Second tier indicators are peel-back quality performance indicators (QPI) that enable accurate assessments of first tier indicators. They are developed by the SM, in conjunction with the lead and using commands.

Single Manager (SM) (DoD)—A Military Department or Agency designated by the Secretary of Defense to be responsible for management of specified commodities or common service activities on a Department of Defense-wide basis.

System Program Office—The AFMC office that is ultimately responsible and accountable for a program's execution.

Sustainment (DoD)—The provision of personnel, logistic, and other support required to maintain and prolong operations or combat until successful accomplishment or revision of the mission or of the national objective.

System Executive Management Report (SEMR)—The SEMR is a semi-annual sustainment and readiness assessment of weapon system programs by the AFMC SM (SM). The report is forwarded to HQ AFMC, who in turn forwards to HQ USAF/IL.

SEMR Process Guide—A guide published by HQ AFMC/DRB that outlines the SEMR process and how the HQ AFMC/DR staff, the SEMR Integrated Product Team (IPT), Air Logistics/Product Centers, and field organizations should plan and execute a SEMR assessment. The SEMR Process Guide is available on the HQ AFMC/DR home page.

SEMR Tasker Message—The HQ USAF/IL message that is sent to all MAJCOMs, Air Logistics and Product Centers prior to the start of each SEMR cycle. The Tasker Message establishes suspenses for coordinating and processing the report, and states the date the report is due to HQ USAF/IL. Additionally, the message will state any requirements for data or information that may be unique to the particular cycle.

Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS)—A Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS)-controlled, automated data system primarily created to provide the National Command Authority and JCS with authoritative identification, location, and resource information. It is used throughout the chain of

command to measure the daily resource status of operating forces.

Using Command—The term used to describe a Major Command (MAJCOM) that possesses (uses) a particular weapon system. When several MAJCOMs possess the same type of weapon system, the Air Force will designate a lead command. If only one Air Force MAJCOM or agency possesses the weapon system, that MAJCOM or agency is the designated lead command.

Windows Integrated Logistics Assessment Model (WINLAM)—Air Force model that calculates daily wartime sortie requirements for specific scenarios and models the dynamics of degradation and recovery over time through parametric equations.

Attachment 2

COST OF OWNERSHIP/COST REDUCTIONS

Cost of Ownership (COS). Cost of Ownership baselines will normally include all operations and maintenance costs (O&M) associated with the day-to-day maintenance, as well as the direct military personnel costs associated with that system. The summation of O&M and personnel military costs are called operations and support costs (O&S). Baseline O&S costs will be extracted through the Automated Budget Interactive Data Environment System (ABIDES) from weapon system Program Elements appropriations as well as appropriations for replenishment spares and will be shown in the format below:

COST ELEMENTS:

- a. Maintenance (Sustaining) Engineering: e.g., Air Force Element of Expense Investment Code (AF EEIC) 583xx
 - b. Software Maintenance: e.g., AF EEIC 540xx
 - c. Consumables: e.g., AF EEIC 60502 and 60902. Include all AF EEIC 60xxx for ICBM and space systems.
 - d. Depot Maintenance: e.g., AF EEIC 541xx, 542xx, 544xx, and 545xx
 - e. Aviation Fuel (AVFUEL): e.g., AF EEIC 699xx, or critical space operations for ICBMs and space systems (if applicable), e.g., AF EEIC 555xx, and 554xx.
 - f. Contractor Services:
 - Interim Contractor Support (ICS) (e.g., AF EEIC 10050, 12050, 20050, and 83050 (investment appropriations))
 - Contractor Logistics Services (CLS) (e.g., AF EEIC 578xx (O&S appropriations))
 - Miscellaneous Contract Services (e.g., AF EEIC 592)
 - g. Depot Level Repairables (DLRs): e.g., AF EEIC 644xx and 645xx
 - h. Mission Personnel (to include operating system training) (The manpower baseline will show military personnel dollars, civilian pay, and the associated programmed end strengths.):
 - Military: e.g., Appropriations 3500, 3700, and 3850 (all AF EEICs)
 - Civilian: e.g., AF EEIC 383xx, 392xx, 51119, and 51500)
 - i. Other: All O&S funding not captured in one of the above categories: (e.g., 4xxxx, 50xxx, 514xx, 52xxx, 53xxx, 546xx, 548xx, 549xx, 55xxx, 56xxx, 570xx, 571xx, 572xx, 573xx, 574xx, 579xx, 580xx, 581xx, 582xx, 584xx, 59xxx, 600xx, 601xx, 602xx, 603xx, 604xx, 60500, 60503, 607xx, 608xx, 60900, 60901, 60903, 60904, 60908, 61xxx, 62xxx, 63xxx, 641xx, 642xx, 643xx, 65xxx, 67xxx, 68xxx, 69000, 69008, 692xx, 693xx, and Investment funding in AF EEIC 12000 and 16300.
- NOTE:** For ICBM and Space Systems, AF EEIC 60xxx are reflected in consumables cost element.

METRICS: For flying weapons, the data will normally be shown in a cost-per-flying hour format. For other weapon systems, the SM, in conjunction with the lead command, will determine the most accurate and effective method to display costs, i.e., cost per operational hour, cost per alert hour, etc.

Cost Reductions: Additionally, and most importantly, each SM will clearly display graphical data that shows the effect of cost reduction initiatives over time (C, C+1, C+2, C+6). This should be shown as bar graphs for projected costs (i.e., costs per flying hour), with graphical lines displaying the effect of cost reduction initiatives over time. The SM must clearly state the reasons for projected cost reductions in the report.

Attachment 3

SEMR PROGRAMS

Air Superiority

F-15A/D

HC-130

Air Superiority Munitions

*AIM-7 Sparrow**AIM-9 Sidewinder**AGM-88 HARM*

AIM-120 Adv Med Range Air-Air Missile (AMRAAM)

Range Threat System (RTS)

Air Combat Training System (ACTS)

HH-60G

Communications and Information

Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems (ATCALs)

High Frequency Global Comm (HFGC)

Personnel and Training

T-1

T-3

T-37

T-38

Space Superiority

Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN)

Defense Meteorological Support Program (DMSP)

Defense Support Program (DSP)

Power Projection

A-10/OA-10

B-1

B-2

B-52

F-15E

F-16

F-117

Harvest Falcon

Harvest Eagle

Air to Surface Munitions

Countermeasures

Cluster Bombs

Conventional Bombs

Paveway

GBU-15 Guided Stand Off Weapon

AGM-65 Maverick

AGM-130 Powered Stand Off Weapon

AGM-142 HAVE NAP

Medium Caliber

Small Arms Ammunitions/Rockets

External Fuel Tanks

AGM 84 D Harpoon

AGM 86C Conventional Air Launched Cruise Missile
(CALCM)**Information Dominance**

E-3 (AWACS)

E-4 (NAOC)

E-8 (JSTARS)

<i>Space Segment</i>	EC-130 (ABCCC)
<i>Fixed Ground Segment</i>	EC-130E (CS)
<i>Mobile Ground Segment</i>	EC-130H (CC)
Navstar Global Positioning System (GPS)	EC-135
MILSATCOM	RC-135
<i>DSCS</i>	U-2
<i>Milstar</i>	
<i>AFSATCOM</i>	Theater Battle Management (TBM)
Launch Programs	Weather
<i>Atlas II</i>	Space Environmental Support System (SESS)
<i>Delta II</i>	Atmospheric Early Warning System (AEWS)
<i>Titan II/IV</i>	Global Theater Air Combat System (GTACS)
<i>ICBMs</i>	Mission Planning System (MPS)
Minuteman	
Peacekeeper	
<i>Cruise Missiles</i>	<u>Global Mobility</u>
AGM129A ACM	C-5
AGM86B ALCM	C-9
<i>Integrated Tactical Warning/Attack Assessment (ITW/AA)</i>	C-17
<i>Cheyenne Mountain Complex (CMC)</i>	C-130E/H
<i>CINC Mobile Alternate HQ (CMAH)</i>	C-141
<i>Missile Warning & Space Surveillance Sensors (MWSSS)</i>	KC-10
Minimum Essential Emergency Comm Network (MEECN)	KC-135
HH-01	MH-53
	MH-60
	AC-130H
	AC-130U
	MC-130E
	MC-130H
	MC-130P
	MC-130N
	Materiel Handling Equipment (MHE)
	AFSOC Munitions

NOTE: Programs/Systems that are *italicized* are not reported individually in the SEMR. They identify a subprogram that is rolled into an overall higher assessment (i.e. the Sidewinder missile assessment is rolled into the overall Air Superiority Munitions assessment), or simply identify a category of programs, where each subprogram is reported independently (i.e. Air to Surface Munitions is the category, but each sub-program is rated independently, with no overall assessment).

Attachment 4**IC 98-1 TO AFI 20-104, SYSTEM EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT REPORT (SEMR)****SUMMARY OF REVISIONS**

This change replace paragraphs [2.4.1.1.](#), [2.4.1.2.](#), [2.6.6.](#) and [2.8.4.](#) with new paragraphs which adjust responsibilities due to the addition of an arbitration process for resolving Red/Green rating splits between the single manager and the lead MAJCOM. See the last attachment of the publication, IC 98-1, for the complete IC. A bar (|) indicates revision from previous edition.

2.4.1.1. Fully review the SEMRs. If the lead MAJCOM has non-concurred (Red/Green split) with the SM on any weapon system assessment, the panel chair will serve as the arbitrator in attempting to resolve the disagreement. If the SM and the lead MAJCOM are still unable to resolve the Red/Green split, the panel's assessment of the weapon system will be the only assessment briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure. The goal is to reach consensus.

2.4.1.2. Concur or non-concur with the SMs assessment. Notify the SM or the SM's designated representative immediately if the panel non-concurs with the SM's assessment. The panel chair will attempt to adjudicate the disagreement in each weapon system assessment. If agreement cannot be reached, both the SM's assessment and the panel's assessment of the weapon system will be briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure, unless the disagreement involves a Red/Green split. In the case of a Red/Green split, the panel's assessment of the weapon system will be the only assessment briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure. The goal is to reach consensus.

2.6.6. Send the completed SEMR to all lead commands for coordination and concurrence/non-concurrence. Every effort must be made to resolve differences of opinion on weapon system assessments. All Red/Green splits sent forward to the Air Staff will be arbitrated by the panel chair and if agreement cannot be reached, the panel will assign a stop-light rating and only the panel's assessment will be briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure.

2.8.4. Incorporate using command concerns into a single response to the SM. Coordinate the consolidated response through all appropriate lead command (MAJCOM) divisions. Every effort must be made to resolve differences of opinion on weapon system assessments. All Red/Green splits sent forward to the Air Staff will be arbitrated by the panel chair and if agreement cannot be reached, the panel will assign a stop-light rating and only the panel's assessment will be briefed through the Air Force Corporate Structure.